

REMARKS AND ARGUMENTS

A. Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-40 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,163,316 ("Killian").

B. Response to the Office Action

The applicant appreciates the examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of claim rejections based on U.S. Patent No. 6,338,094 ("Scott") after the previous Response. Before it becomes necessary to appeal of the new rejections made in light of Killian, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of those rejections.

The invention as claimed in the pending claims relates generally to a type of remote programming of a media recorder, performed over a network such as the World Wide Web. For example, an individual browsing the Web at his office may see on a Web page an advertisement for a scheduled television program. The applicant's disclosure enables that individual to program his home media recorder to record the program simply by clicking on the advertisement from his office. Because an individual's office and his home media recorder may be widely separated, the applicant's disclosure describes technologies for associating the user with his recorder. These technologies make use of identification information, such as digital

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 04 2007

"cookies," each of which can contain "user id and a unit serial number for the [digital video recorder] associated with the user id." Par. [00182].

Whereas the technologies described in the applicants' disclosure enable a particularly convenient way to program one's recorder over the Web, the Killian reference merely provides a way to program one's recorder locally. A local user of Killian's system may benefit from other capabilities of the Web: for example, program guide information can free a user from manually entering a program's start time, and the user may be able to view a Web site about a program while the program is playing. This is not the same, though, as being able to program one's recorder over the Web using the technologies disclosed by the applicant. Given the divergent goals of the applicant's disclosure versus that of Killian, it is not surprising that Killian fails to disclose each element recited in the applicant's claims. Because of these shortcomings of the Killian disclosure, described in further detail below, Killian cannot anticipate the applicant's claims, and the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites the use of an "advertisement" in the programming of a media recorder. It provides for "selection of the advertisement," and programming of the media recorder is performed "in response to selection of the advertisement." Killian does not disclose any such uses of an advertisement. In particular, the only

advertisements described in Killian are advertisements for products shown during a commercial break:

During a commercial break in the program, information regarding the advertised product might be retrieved from a web site associated with the product and synchronously and integrally displayed along with the commercial.

See col. 5, lines 62-66.

For example, with respect to updating integrated displays, if a program switches to a commercial break, control API 60 may cause a web page or other Internet information associated with the advertised product to be displayed on television 40 in synchronization with the displayed commercial to provide additional product information or an opportunity to order or comment on the product.

See col. 7, lines 16-22. There is no disclosure in Killian of any recording being performed or scheduled in response to any advertisement. In consequence, Killian cannot anticipate claim 1.

Claims 19, 24, and 37

Claims 19, 24, and 37 all recite a step of "receiving ... a selection of an advertisement of a broadcast program." As noted above with respect to claim 1, Killian does not disclose any "advertisement of a broadcast program," nor any way to select any such advertisement. Consequently, the step of "receiving" such a selection is likewise not disclosed in Killian.

Claims 19, 24, and 37 further recite the extraction of "identification information" that is used for "logging into the source web service" (claim 19) or

"accessing" such a service (claims 24, 37). The Office Action equates the claimed "identification information" with the "viewer profiles" described by Killian in column 10, lines 1-17. The viewer profiles described in that excerpt of Killian, however, are not used to log in to any web service; rather, they amount only to a collection of user preferences:

For each option presented to the viewer in connection with preference templates 82, preference templates 82 allow the viewer to provide ranking information that EPG 70 uses to generate viewer profile 84 and provide enhanced viewing opportunities according to viewer profile 84, as discussed more fully below. Referring to FIG. 4, genre preference template 82 includes options 86 and corresponding rankings 88 in any suitable presentation format that is viewable on television 40. In one embodiment, the viewer provides a ranking 88 for each option 86 to indicate the desirability of programming associated with option 86 according to any suitable scale, standard, or other criteria. For example, for each option 86, template 82 might include any number of circles, boxes, or other locations on template 82 that each correspond to a qualitative assessment of the degree to which the viewer will likely enjoy programming associated with option 86.

Col. 10, lines 1-17. It is not disclosed in Killian to use one's user preferences to log on to a web service. Moreover, the Office Action equates the claimed "web service" with Killian's disclosure of "an EPG applet 70 that is downloaded from the Internet to run on platform 12." Col. 8, lines 5-7. This applet, however, is not a "web service." It may originally have been downloaded from the Internet, but it is executed locally, and the tasks it performs are performed locally. By analogy, a person running a copy of Adobe Acrobat or other software on his local computer is not said to be using a "web service" merely because that software may have been purchased and downloaded over the web.

Claim 29

Claim 29 recites the use of a "first server" and a "second server." The Office Action equates these servers with elements 46 and 48, respectively, of Killian. Although element 46 is a "database server," element 48 is merely the "database" that is maintained by the database server; it is not a separate server. In particular, claim 29 recites that the second server operates to "authenticat[e]" the user and to "program the media-based device." Killian, however, contains no disclosure of elements 46 or 48—or any other element—performing "authentication." Elements 46 and 48 merely provide program schedules: they do not require authentication to access these schedules, and even if their scheduling information is useful for programming the recorder of Killian, they do not themselves "access[] the media-based device to program the media-based device," as recited in claim 29.

Claim 33

Claim 33, like claims 1, 19, 24, and 37, recites the programming of a media-based device in response to selection of an online advertisement, a feature not disclosed in Killian. Moreover, claim 33 recites that selection of the advertisement is performed at "a client side system," while the automatic programming of the media-based device is performed by "a server side system." In the rejection of claim 33, the Office Action equates the claimed "server side system" with the use of a local "EPG

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 04 2007

API" that queries a program guide database (48). The program guide database, however, merely provides information on the program schedule; it does not program the media-based device. Rather, the media device is programmed on the client side, by the EPG API.

Claim 35

Like claims 1, 19, 24, 33, and 37, claim 35 recites the programming of a media-based device through a selection of an advertisement. As discussed above, this feature is not recited in Killian.


Dependent Claims

Because the remaining claims in the application depend from independent claims 1, 19, 24, 29, 33, 35, and 37 discussed above, they incorporate the limitations of those claims and further distinguish the invention from the prior art. Accordingly, those claims are likewise believed to be in a condition for allowance.

C. Conclusion

The applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in a condition for allowance and earnestly solicits an early notice to that effect. If any issues with the application may be resolved telephonically, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's representative at (312)913-2115.

Date: September 4, 2007



Jeffrey A. Steck
Reg. No. 40,184